

# FOUNDATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

## POLICY WORKGROUP MEETING NINE MEETING SUMMARY

*The ninth Foundational Public Health Services (FPHS) policy workgroup meeting took place on December 17th, 2014 from 9:30am to 3:30pm at the Museum of Flight in Tukwila, WA.*

*The meeting objective was to come to consensus about AIS – what to include in the workgroup report and what to include in other documents; finalize the content for the workgroup report; review and build on existing communication planning efforts.*

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

John Wiesman welcomed everyone to the meeting, and thanked everyone for attending – acknowledging that this is a busy week for everyone. John stated that he will share an email over the upcoming week with his response to Governor Inslee's 2015-17 DOH section of the budget. He explained that the focus of this final FPHS meeting was to review the draft document with the policy workgroup, receive feedback on key issues, and come to a consensus. Todd Mielke thanked the policy workgroup members for not only being here today, but also attending the webinar meeting that took place prior to this one. He reminded everyone why the workgroup came together – the objective and the purpose. He asked the workgroup to think about the answer to this question, "Have we done an effective level of defining what the problem is and how to fix it?"

Fauna reminded the workgroup that the draft document will be something that can be shared on an ad hoc basis. The Public Health Roundtable and the Department of Health (DOH) are planning to provide feedback on the draft document from a communications point of view. There have already been some internal revisions with the Co-Chairs, comments from the workgroup members, and also a webinar for policy workgroup members to provide feedback.

Fauna also reviewed the agenda – review and discuss communication planning, review the policy workgroup review draft report 4.0, and come to a consensus on AIS.

### REVIEW AND DISCUSS COMMUNICATION PLANNING

#### **The Public Health Roundtable**

Adrienne Thompson spoke about communication planning in relation to messaging on the FPHS draft document. Adrienne presented on the Public Health Roundtable and the work it has done related to public health advocacy. Adrienne explained that the Public Health Roundtable is an organization of non-governmental public health organizations and groups that are trying a new approach to promoting public health. Adrienne presented a one page flyer that the Public Health Roundtable created to market how public health ensures public safety.

Discussion about Adrienne's presentation included the following points:

- It is important to educate the public that public health is related to the whole population and not just specialized populations.
- It would be helpful for the policy workgroup to have copies of the flyers to distribute.
- More information is available on the Washington State Health website.

- The Nurses Association has also done a lot of good work on this effort.
- It can take months to organize this level of outreach and marketing, and it is something that necessitates money and time.
- If FPHS is not marketed efficiently, it will not get traction.
- FPHS should be marketed through other non-public health organizations such as nonprofits and religious organizations.

### **The Department of Health**

DOH presented on their on-going communication efforts. DOH is working on putting together a plan that will address a mix of communication needs and strategies for attaining specific communication goals. They plan to spend the next 6 month period lining up partners and strategizing on how best to approach the legislator for the 2016 legislative session.

Jennifer Tebaldi explained that the state of Washington by defining foundational public health services, is leading the way nationally. A marketing and communications firm has been brought in to help with the national effort. Jennifer suggested that the state of Washington can pilot some of the national language. She advocated that the group consider how to mesh its work with the political reality of moving forward.

Discussion and comments included the following:

- There are challenges with funding in Washington, it is important to think of how FPHS helps save money - after all prevention is less expensive than treating illness.
- There are no constituents saying we need public health. Public health does not have victims, the Sheriff, or a District Attorney advocating for increased funding.
- It may not be useful to talk to *all* elected officials, but having a focus group with a few elected officials could help identify compelling stories that generate support.

## **OVERVIEW OF POLICY WORKGROUP REVIEW DRAFT 4.0 REPORT**

The FPHS policy workgroup discussed the final FPHS draft section by section. Workgroup members provided feedback on specific issues and there was a general discussion about each section. While there was agreement in most areas, and all of the major recommendations, there were several instances of significant disagreement about what might work best or be most compelling. It was agreed that the co-chairs could make the final calls on those points. The most recent revised draft is based on the feedback received at the meeting.

## **AIS DISCUSSION**

There were three variations (A, B, and C) of three different recommendations (1, 2, and 3) for Additional Important Services. Fauna asked the workgroup members to rate their agreement with each of the nine sentences using a dot sticker. The range of agreement was – strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Following the dot exercise, it appeared that the workgroup members were divided across the nine different sentences without much consensus. Fauna asked the workgroup members to write an AIS sentence, and then find another workgroup member that had a similar sentence or would agree with your original sentence. The exercise resulted in four sentences, and policy workgroup members were asked to share if they could not support including each of those sentences in the final report with the results as follows:

- A. We would like to incentivize local spending on AIS so we recommend making a matching fund to encourage local spending on AIS.  
*Cannot support: one*
- B. AIS funding shall be shared by LHJs, fees, federal sources as determined by local entities demonstrated by proportional match levels.  
*Cannot support: six*
- C. AIS funding shall be shared by LHJs, fees, state, federal sources as determined by local entities demonstrated by proportional match levels.  
*Cannot support: one*
- D. State and locals maintain current funding levels for AIS. Current FPHS spent at local level (except fees to be used for FPHS) be spent on local AIS. This would be a requirement.  
*Cannot support: eight*

During a previous meeting it was determined that the policy workgroup would still include a recommendation if there was a maximum of one workgroup member that could not support the statement. Therefore, statements A and C will be included in the FPHS draft document.

## PERMISSION FOR FUTURE CHANGES

Multiple policy workgroup members mentioned that they felt uncomfortable with the policy workgroup being the group to make the final decisions on wording choices for communicating about FPHS. It was proposed that:

- The Public Health Roundtable and the Department of Health form an FPHS communication group and identify resources to work with a market research firm to identify word choices, ideas, images, and stories that resonate with the general public and elected officials and should be used in FPHS communication materials.
- The communication group would then host a webinar for the FPHS policy workgroup members to provide feedback on the recommended changes and additions.

The policy workgroup agreed to the proposal with the following caveats:

- The concepts be maintained, and when words do get changed, the distinctions remain clear.
- The word “foundational” needs to remain so that Washington continues to be aligned with, and seen as a key part of, the national effort.
- The new suggestions are identified and shared for feedback as soon as possible. Many people are already using the concepts of foundational capabilities and services in their budget planning.

## ROUNDTABLE

The policy workgroup members provided the following feedback regarding the policy workgroup process: interesting process; excited to be involved in the upcoming tribal work; have a great deal of respect for everyone involved – the workgroup members, facilitators and leaders; it was a hard but necessary process; it is important to look for funding sources; high caliber of conversation; respect for what the non-public workgroup members said; good end product; without FPHS equitably distributed across the state, health care is a lot harder; continue to be amazed at how the state can come together; a lot of these types of reports ends up sitting on a bookcase and it is important to make sure this does not happen again; appreciate the difficult conversations; appreciate the input and perspective from everyone; hope we connect with Olympia and have a voice in the Association for Counties; thank you to the technical workgroup for all the work done before this; even when we differ on language and approaches, we have the same goal in mind; the tribes have been in parts of Washington for thousands of years and having the tribes be part of this process is important.

## CLOSING STATEMENTS FROM THE CO-CHAIRS

Todd and John gave closing statements. Todd thanked everyone for coming and said he was impressed by the effort everyone gave. He thanked the technical group for laying the foundation for the policy workgroup. He reminded policy workgroup members that they will most likely be called upon at some point to explain their experience, and that will be important in promoting FPHS.

John also thanked all workgroup members for their effort and time. He thanked everyone for being such a great team, and reminded everyone to keep building on the good work that has been accomplished. He explained that he really valued the work done by both the FPHS technical workgroup and the FPHS policy workgroup. John thanked Jennifer for representing the state of Washington in Washington DC on the national level. He emphasized that he looked forward to working with tribal leaders to create a stronger tribal public health system. He asked everyone to keep building on what has been developed, and participate as leaders in the state on advocating for FPHS.

## NEXT STEPS

The technical group co-chairs, policy group co-chairs, and project management team will take the current draft, make the recommended changes, and email it to the policy workgroup members for their final comments before the Martin Luther King Junior holiday on January 19, 2015.